REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued September 4, 2008, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,774,887 ("Wolff") in view of Batres, U.S. Patent No. 6,832,351 ("Batres").

Claims 1-15 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

The present invention is not obvious in view of the references relied upon in the Office Action, as the prior art references do not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the present invention.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15 are not unpatentable over Wolff in view of Batres because the combination of Wolff and Batres does not disclose or suggest monitoring data values entered into said at least one data entry field, and, in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, or storing corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the plurality of data values; causing a data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attributes, as required by claims 1 and 3. The combination of Wolff and Batres only discloses displaying the same data entry fields regardless of the data value entered into a data entry field.

Wolff discloses, in Fig. 2, a task object 60 that includes a plurality of slots 60c-60g that contain pointer to the individual forms that need to be filled out by a customer service representative to complete a task. (*See* col. 6, lines 46-55) Wolff further discloses

that each task object includes a pointer to each form object (forms 1-7) that is required to complete a task, and that the forms that need to be filled out for a given task are determined when the form generating system is set up. (*See* col. 6, lines 64-67) Firstly, as Wolff expressly discloses, each task object is associated with a task to be performed, not with a data value that is stored for a data entry field. Wolff does not disclose or suggest for the at least one data entry field, storing a plurality of data values, as is required by claims 1 and 3. Secondly, the forms 1-7 are associated with the task, not with any particular data value. Wolff does not disclose or suggest storing corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the plurality of data values; causing a data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attributes, as is required by claims 1 and 3. Further, as the Examiner indicates, Wolff does not disclose monitoring data values entered into said at least one data entry field, and, in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, as is required by claims 1 and 3.

Batres discloses a blank control 102 that, when invoked by a template data control 134, generates a query to obtain customer name data based on the current recordset and displayed. The remaining blank controls 104-120 similarly obtain, fill in, and display the appropriate data in text or other form. A signal control may retrieve information for other controls and pass that information to the other controls for display. Examples of such information include customer name, address and telephone number, which are passed to the controls related to name data, address data, and telephone number data. (*See* Batres

col. 6, line 56 to col. 7, line 8) Firstly, Batres does not disclose or suggest monitoring data values entered into said at least one data entry field. Batres discloses the blank controls 102-120 performing actions when invoked by the template data control 134, not when data values are entered into a control. Secondly, Batres discloses retrieving particular data values for entry and display in the controls, not displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field. As a result, Batres does not disclose or suggest monitoring data values entered into said at least one data entry field, and, in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, as is required by claims 1 and 3. Further, Batres does not disclose or suggest storing corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the plurality of data values; causing a data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attributes, as is required by claims 1 and 3.

Even if Wolff and Batres were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the resulting combination still would not disclose or suggest monitoring data values entered into said at least one data entry field, and, in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, or storing corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the

plurality of data values; causing a data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attributes, as is required by claims 1 and 3.

Therefore, claims 1 and 3, and claims 2 and 4-15, are not unpatentable over Wolff in view of Batres.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4545 (5231-051-US01).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Michael A. Schwartz, #40,161/

Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: December 4, 2008

Hanify & King, P.C.
1875 K Street, N.W., Suite 707
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 403-2100 Tel.
(202) 429-4380 Fax